

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/762,608	MOUNT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Brett S. Squires	2836	

**All Participants:**

(1) Brett S. Squires.

(2) Everett D. Robinson.

**Status of Application: 89/Notice of Allowability**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 21 June 2005

**Time:** 12:40pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Gordon (US 5,808,376) and Gilbert (US 2003/0007369) and Kenny (US 2003/0202344) and Brand (US 5,764,504) and Bigotti (US 4,160,571).*

Claims discussed:

*1, 5, 11, 14, and 19*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Bigotti (US 4,160,571)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner agreed with the applicant's argument that the Shoe Cabinet disclosed by Bigotti was non-analogous art and the applicant agreed to insert the limitations recited in claim 5 into claim 1 and the limitations recited in claim 14 into claim 11, the examiner also stated that claim 19 was allowable over the prior art because it already contained the limitations pertaining to the battery rack .